

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The office action of March 12, 2008 has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-20, 22, 26-31, 37-42, 45 and 48-52 are pending in this application. By this amendment claims 1-20, 22, 26-31, 37-42, 45 and 48-52 have been amended and claims 21, 23-25, 32-36, 43, 44, 46 and 47 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 31

Claims 1 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,345,288 to Reed et al. (Reed). Independent claims 1 and 31, as amended, recite subject matter of now-cancelled dependent claims 21 and 23-25, and 32-36, respectively.

For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 31 are not anticipated by Reed.

Claims 1-20, 22, 26-31, 37-42, 45 and 48-52

Claims 1-15, 18, 20-25, 27-36, 39, 41-47 and 49-52 stand rejected under U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. publication no. 2003/0074358 to Sarbaz et al. (Sarbaz).

Claims 16-17, 26, 37-38 and 48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sarbaz, in view of U.S. Pat. No. 7,162,427 to Myrick et al. (Myrick). Claims 19 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sarbaz, in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,564,263 to Bergman et al. (Bergman).

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-20, 22, 26-31, 37-42, 45 and 48-52 are respectfully requested.

Independent claims 1, 31 and 42, as amended, recite subject matter pertaining to one or more of the following: a knowledge manager having one or more of the following metadata applications: a data model manager, a dictionary manager, a knowledge entity manager, a data mapper, and a change manager; and a metadata repository comprising: a knowledge portion, a knowledge entity portion, a data mapping portion, a data dictionary portion and a change

management portion. Much of this subject matter was included in now-cancelled dependent claims 21, 23-25, 32-36, 43, 44, 46 and 47.

The Office Action fails to provide a *prima facie* basis for rejecting claims that included this subject matter (e.g., dependent claims 21, 23-25, 32-36, 43, 44, 46 and 47). Instead, the Office Action generally refers to portions of Sarbaz and simply alleges that the reference discloses these features. Applicant respectfully disagrees and, if the Patent Office maintains rejections related to this subject matter based on Sarbaz, requests that the Patent Office identify specific features of Sarbaz that are analogous to this subject matter and provide a detailed basis for the rejections.

Neither Myrick nor Bergman overcome the deficiencies of Sarbaz noted above nor were they relied upon to do so.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 31 and 42, as well as claims 2-20, 22, 26-30, 37-41, 45 and 48-52 depending therefrom, are allowable over the cited prior art.

Application. No.: 10/510,045
Reply to Office Action of March 12, 2008

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 12, 2008

By: /Anthony W. Kandare/
Anthony W. Kandare, reg. no. 48,830

BANNER & WITCOFF, Ltd.
1100 13th St., N. W., Suite 1200
Washington, D. C. 20005-4051
Telephone: (202) 824-3000
Facsimile: (202) 824-3001